

REMARKS

I. Status of the Claims

Claims 1, 3-40, and 42-58 are pending in this application. Claims 2 and 41 are cancelled. Claims 4, 6-11, 21-39 and 48-58 stand as withdrawn from consideration by the Examiner. Claims 1, 3, 12-19, 40, and 42-46 are amended herein. Support for the resin compatible coating comprising a plurality of particles as recited in independent claims 1 and 40 can be found, for example, in claims 2 and 41 as originally filed, and on pages 11-12 of the specification. Claims 3, 12-19 and 42-46 were amended to correct their dependencies further to the cancellation of claims 2 and 41. Accordingly, the foregoing amendments raise no issue of new matter.

II. Rejections under 35 U.S.C. § 103(a)

A. Nagamine

Claims 1, 18, 40, and 47 were rejected under 35 U.S.C. § 103(a) as being unpatentable over Japanese Patent Publication No. 1-249333 ("Nagamine") for reasons set forth on pages 2-6 of the Office Action dated May 6, 2003. Applicants submit the foregoing amendments to independent claims 1 and 40, which incorporate the subject matter of non-rejected claims 2 and 41, respectively, render moot this rejection. Accordingly, Applicants respectfully request that this rejection be withdrawn.

B. Nagamine in view of Adolfovna

Claims 2, 3, 5, 12-17, 19, 20, and 41-46 were rejected under 35 U.S.C. § 103(a) as being unpatentable over Nagamine in view of Russian Patent Publication No.

2072121 ("Adolfovna") for reasons set forth on pages 2-6 of the Office Action dated May 6, 2003. Applicants respectfully traverse this rejection.

Claims 1 and 40 now recite:

1. A reinforced laminate adapted for an electronic support, the laminate comprising: (a) a matrix material; and (b) at least one non-degreased fabric comprising at least one strand comprising a plurality of fibers, wherein at least a portion of the fabric has a resin compatible coating which is compatible with the matrix material in the reinforced laminate adapted for the electronic support, and the resin compatible coating comprises a plurality of particles.

40. An electronic support comprising (a) at least one non-degreased fabric comprising at least one strand comprising a plurality of fibers, wherein at least a portion of the fabric has a resin compatible coating which is compatible with a matrix material; and (b) at least one matrix material on at least a portion of the at least one fabric; wherein the resin compatible coating comprises a plurality of particles.

Thus, amended claims 1 and 40 recite, *inter alia*, at least: 1) a non-degreased fabric; and 2) a resin compatible coating comprising a plurality of particles on at least a portion of the non-degreased fabric.

In order to establish a *prima facie* case of obviousness, the Examiner must show at least that the cited prior art references, taken in combination, (1) would have provided the motivation for one of ordinary skill in the art to make the modification suggested by the Examiner; and (2) that the prior art references, when combined, teach or suggest each and every element recited in the claims. See M.P.E.P. § 2143. Applicants respectfully submit the Examiner failed to meet these criteria for the reasons that follow.

Nagamine discloses a glass cloth for a laminate, wherein the glass cloth may comprise a fabric of glass fibers that has been impregnated with a resin material such as an epoxy. Nagamine, page 2. Nagamine further discloses that the fabric of glass

fibers can be coated with a wide variety of sizing coatings, including a “recently developed non-desized size coating, which does not require degreasing prior to being impregnated with the resin material.” *Id.*, page 10. As recognized by the Examiner, however, Nagamine does not teach or suggest of any size coating comprising a plurality of particles as recited in the instant claims. The Examiner then relies upon the disclosure of Adolfovna to make up for this deficiency.

Adolfovna teaches a substrate for a printed circuit board, wherein the circuit board comprises basalt fabric sheets that have been impregnated with a polymer binder or matrix. Adolfovna, page 2. Furthermore, Adolfovna teaches incorporating boron nitride particle into *the polymer binder*. *Id.* (emphasis added). Specifically Adolfovna states, “[t]he suggested substrate for printed circuit boards has a multilayer structure consisting of basalt fabric sheets impregnated with a polymer thermosetting *binder* containing 2-10% boron nitride.” *Id.* (emphasis added).

Thus, while Adolfovna discloses basalt fabric sheets, Nagamine discloses glass fabric sheets. Additionally, while Adolfovna discloses a polymer binder or matrix containing boron nitride particles, Adolfovna is completely silent with respect to 1) any resin compatible coating, and 2) the incorporation of boron nitride particles into a resin compatible coating.

Applicants respectfully submit that nothing in either Nagamine or Adolfovna would have led one of ordinary skill in the art to combine the references in the manner suggested by the Examiner. For example, Applicants respectfully submit that the disclosures of the two references are limited to the different fabric sheets disclosed in each reference: Adolfovna discloses only basalt fabric sheets, which are structurally

different from the glass fabric sheets of Nagamine, which are the only fabric sheets disclosed in Nagamine. Based on these divergent and limited disclosures, Applicants submit that there would have exists no motivation to modify the references in the manner suggested by the Examiner.

Additionally, while the Examiner relies upon Nagamine to disclose a sizing coating that does not require degreasing or surface treatment, the Examiner dismisses the fact that Adolfovna fails to disclose any such “non-desizing coating.” In fact, the disclosure relied upon by the Examiner in Adolfovna is directed to a polymeric matrix, rather than any sizing coating on fibers. Simply put, the two references are directed to different components: Nagamine is directed to a sizing coating, while Adolfovna is directed to a polymeric matrix. Based at least on the different functions of these separate components, one of ordinary skill in the art would not have been led to take a component from the polymeric matrix of Adolfovna and incorporated it into the sizing agent of Nagamine.

Moreover, even if the references were combined in the manner suggested by the Examiner, and Applicants again submit that no motivation exists in Nagamine and Adolfovna to do so, such a combination still fails to teach or suggest each and every element recited in independent claims 1 and 40. Based on the teachings of Adolfovna discussed above, and solely for the sake of argument, this reference can only suggest, at best, the incorporation of boron nitride particles into a polymeric matrix. As recited in independent claims 1 and 40, however, the plurality of particles are comprised in the resin compatible coating. The combination proposed by the Examiner fails to suggest the incorporation of the boron nitride particles of Adolfovna into the non-desized size

coating of Nagamine. Accordingly, even if combined in the manner suggested by the Examiner, each and every element recited in the independent claims is not present in the combination.

Accordingly, Applicants respectfully submit that the Examiner failed to establish a prima facie case of obviousness with respect to the pending claims, and respectfully request that this § 103(a) rejection be withdrawn.

III. Conclusion

In view of the foregoing amendments and remarks, Applicants respectfully submit that the present application is not obvious in view of the references cited against it. Applicants respectfully request the Examiner's reconsideration of the application, and the timely allowance of the pending claims.

Please grant any extensions of time required to enter this response and charge any additional required fees to our Deposit Account No. 06-0916.

Respectfully submitted,

FINNEGAN, HENDERSON, FARABOW,
GARRETT & DUNNER, L.L.P.

Dated: March 3, 2004

By: 
Mark D. Sweet
Reg. No. 41,469